

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated February 1, 2011, Assignee respectfully requests reconsideration based on the above amendments and the following remarks. Assignee respectfully submits that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

Claims 12, 13 and 17-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Yokota in view of Bide and Hakala. This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

Claim 12 recites “providing a view of surroundings to a user device worn by the user in response to a position and orientation of the user, the view provided to the user device being the same user view as if the user were not wearing the user device; determining a location in the view by determining the location in the view to be within a specified distance from the user and within an orientation of the view vis-a-vis the user orientation” (emphasis added). Support for the new features is found in at least page 7, lines 17-25 of the specification. In applying the references, the Office Action cites to Hakala as disclosing providing identification information when a user comes within range of a location, and cites the point of interest in Hakala. Hakala discloses the points of interest on a map view, as shown in Figure 4 and disclosed in column 12, lines 8-22. The points of interest displayed in Hakala based on distance to the user are not displayed on a realistic view of the user. If the “points of interest” in Hakala were incorporated into Yokota, the result would be presenting points of interest in a map view as disclosed by Hakala. This is contrary to claim 12, which recites “determining a location in the view by determining the location in the view to be within a specified distance from the user”, where the view is the “same view as if the user were not wearing the user device.” The map view of Hakala is not the “same view as if the user were not wearing the user device.” The map view in Hakala is an additional view to the person’s field of view (See Abstract of Hakala). As such, even if Yokota in view of Bide and Hakala are combined, the features of claim 12 do not result.

For at least the above reasons, claim 12 is patentable over Yokota in view of Bide and Hakala. Claims 13, 17 and 19-21 are dependent on claim 12 and are patentable over Yokota in view of Bide and Hakala for at least the reasons advanced with reference to claim 12.

In view of the foregoing remarks and amendments, Assignee submits that the above-identified application is now in condition for allowance. Early notification to this effect is respectfully requested.

If there are any charges with respect to this response or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /David A. Fox/
David A. Fox
Registration No. 38,807
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
20 Church Street
22nd Floor
Hartford, CT 06103-3207
Telephone (860) 286-2929
Facsimile (860) 286-0115
Customer No. 36192

Date: May 2, 2011